

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2005 has been carefully reviewed along with the references cited therein. In the subject Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-10. Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-5 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) (Fig. 2) in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,073).

The Examiner's combination of AAPA and Patel fails to teach or suggest each limitation of claim 1. AAPA teaches "output switches Q1, Q2, are normally mounted on separate heat sinks 30, 32 each of which has a platform 34." Page 4, lines 12-13. Claim 1 recites a heat dissipation platform comprising "a conductive plate with first and second generally parallel surfaces ... said switches being mounted on said first surface." As seen in FIGURE 2 and as described in the specification, in AAPA the switches Q1, Q2 are not mounted on a first surface of a conductive plate, instead the switches are located on separate first surfaces of separate heat sinks. Accordingly, the Examiner's combination of AAPA and Patel does not teach or suggest each limitation of claim 1.

Furthermore, neither reference provides a motivation to modify such that the switches are mounted on a first surface of a conductive plate. Applicants recognized the desirability to equalize the temperature of switches Q1 and Q2 especially in an unbalanced AC operation. Neither AAPA nor Patel suggest the modification of mounting the switches on the first surface of the plate. Accordingly, claim 1 patentably defines over the cited references.

Claims 6-8 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's § 112 rejection. Claims 9 and 10 have also been amended to overcome the Examiner's § 112 rejection. In view of the claim amendments and that the Examiner has not established *prima facie* obviousness for claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15 and 16 have been added to the application and depend from claim 1. Since these claims depend from an allowable independent claim, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 17 has also been added to the application. Support for the newly added

claim is found in FIGURE 3. Applicant submits that claim 17 patentably defines over any proper combination of AAPA and Patel.

### CONCLUSION


For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited. In any event, should the Examiner consider personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, she is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

7/27/05

Date



Robert V. Vickers, Reg. No. 19,504  
 Jonathan A. Withrow, Reg. No. 54,548  
 1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor  
 Cleveland, OH 44114-2579  
 216-861-5582

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature
	<u>Laurie A. Boylan</u>
Date	Printed Name
<u>July 28, 2005</u>	Laurie A. Boylan